UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS LAREDO DIVISION

| UNITE | ED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | CRIMINAL |
|-------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| | |) | _ |
| | Plaintiff, |) | Laredo, Texas |
| | |) | Wednesday, January 15, 2020 |
| | vs. |) | (8:01 a.m. to 8:32 a.m.) |
| | |) | |
| LUIS | MONTES-PATINO, |) | CASE NO: 5:17-CR-00560-6 |
| | |) | |
| | Defendant. |) | |

STATUS CONFERENCE / SENTENCING (IN ABSTENCIA)

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARINA GARCIA MARMOLEJO,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Appearances: See next page

Case Managers: Angie Trevino / Erica Lopez

Court Recorder [ECRO]: Edgar Hernandez

Deputy U.S. Marshal: Bobbie Molina

Transcribed by: Exceptional Reporting Services, Inc.

P.O. Box 8365

Corpus Christi, TX 78468

361 949-2988

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

APPEARANCES FOR:

Plaintiff: JOSE ANGEL MORENO, ESQ.

Assistant United States Attorney

P.O. Box 1179

Laredo, Texas 78042-1179

Defendant: ROBERTO BALLI, ESQ.

P.O. Box 1058

Laredo, Texas 78042

U.S. Probation: Gary Weiss / Laura Cruz

1300 Victoria, Suite 2111

Laredo, Texas 78040

Laredo, Texas; Wednesday, January 15, 2020; 8:01 a.m.

<u>Call to Order</u>

THE COURT: We are calling Cause Number L:17-0560, it's Defendant Number 6 and we have a Status Conference for both husband and wife it should be, it's not noted on the Docket, but it should be for Luis Montes Patino and also the other -- who was his wife?

MR. BALLI: Adriana Galvan-Constantini.

THE CLERK: She's at 10:00 o'clock, Judge.

THE COURT: Oh, she's at 10:00 o'clock.

THE CLERK: That was the only early -- he's a trial.

THE COURT: Oh, that's right. That's right, that's

the reason you're here earlier. Okay.

MR. BALLI: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, so, Mr. Balli, you represented or represent Luis Montes Patino. Can you give me a status of what we know?

MR. BALLI: Your Honor, yesterday my staff made a phone call to Mr. Montes Patino's phone number and the phone was operable. They left a voice mail message that the case was set for today and that's our last contact with, you know, the last time we made contact or attempted contact was everything was put on the record before -- last time we were here we attempted to make contact with him. And so we had notice of this setting I guess on Monday of this week, and so we

that, your Honor, they have just basically disappeared before they were first set for sentencing. THE COURT: Okay, so, again, no question they were

22

23

24

25

given notice of the first setting; no question that they

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and his wife, who is a co-Defendant in the case, were residing in Dallas and they were directly being supervised out of Dallas, but you maintained contact with the Dallas Division --PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER CRUZ: Yes, your Honor. And back in May of 2019 is when we first learned that the battery was low on the GPS device; that they were supposed to be traveling into Laredo to meet with Mr. Balli; that they were obviously told that they had a setting and never came in. Have you, for the Dallas Division, had any contact with them since then? PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER CRUZ: No, your Honor. After this Petition was submitted, that was the last information that we received. THE COURT: And you're referring to the Petition for Action on conditions of Pretrial release? PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER CRUZ: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. All right, very well. Marshals? UNITED STATES MARSHAL PEREZ: Yes, your Honor. Mr. Moreno mentioned we, the US Marshals, made an attempt, our Dallas Division, we sent a lead and they made an attempt on June 26. They met with the Defendants Luis Montes Patino's brother-in-law and sister-in-law in Dallas and the brother-inlaw named Daniel Constantini stated that he had not seen the

```
Defendants in two weeks from the date of the visit and that he believed that they're in San Luis Potosi, Mexico.
```

Since then, your Honor, we ran crossings and -- may I approach or --

THE COURT: Well, no, I mean, there is nobody here so we -- if there's something that you think would jeopardize an ongoing investigation then don't state it on the record at this time.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL PEREZ: Okay. So the last -THE COURT: But the point of this is that we have
made attempts to locate them, that we're satisfied that they're
no longer in the United States of America; that they're
fugitives in another country, is that your belief?

UNITED STATES MARSHAL PEREZ: Yes, your Honor. And I further believe that the co-surety for Ms. Constantini has perhaps more information because he was interviewed also in Dallas, and we're going to entertain that again and make another attempt to visit him in Dallas.

THE COURT: Okay. And --

UNITED STATES MARSHAL PEREZ: Okay.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL HINOJOSA: And, your Honor, the reason I'm here is because the wife, Deputy Perez has the case for the husband and I have the case for the wife. And the information that we have sent to Dallas it mirrors the same case because they're both together and we determined that --

```
1
    your Honor said, we determined that they are in Mexico and --
 2
              THE COURT: Don't intend to return to the US to be
 3
    sentenced?
              UNITED STATES MARSHAL HINOJOSA: Yes.
 4
                                                      And most of
 5
    the family members keep saying the same thing, they have no
 6
    idea where they're at.
 7
              THE COURT: Which is not believable, but -- all
 8
    right. Any other information? No?
 9
              PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER CRUZ: No, your Honor.
10
              UNITED STATES MARSHAL HINOJOSA: No, your Honor.
11
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. Mr. Balli, Mr. Moreno, do you want
12
    to inquire further of any of these individuals?
13
              MR. MORENO: Not from the Government.
14
              MR. BALLI: No, your Honor.
15
                         All right, thank you.
              THE COURT:
16
              All right, so, Mr. Moreno, you filed a Motion on
17
    behalf of the Government asking that this case, specifically as
18
    to both of these Defendants, Mr. Patino and Ms. Constantini, be
19
    separate Status Conference/Sentencing hearing.
20
              Are you asking that the Court go forward with a
21
    sentencing hearing in absentia for Mr. Patino and
22
    Ms. Constantini?
23
              MR. MORENO: Yes, your Honor. If we can go back for
```

just a second, the case was originally set and they failed to Judge Alvarez, at the request of Defense counsel, appear.

24

25

allowed them time to be able to try to communicate with their counsel and file any objections they might have and then reset the case, and then it went back to this court.

She also wanted them to have an opportunity to discuss the case with the court, and we had another Status Conference in June of last year where, again, it was reported they made no contact with them.

Other than the original filings for the objections on the PSRs and everyone's responses and replies they have made no further Motions.

In addition to all of this it's really, you know, hampering our efforts to deal with, to complete an extradition package for them because there is no final conclusion to the case because there is no judgment on them, and so we can't really proceed with that without doing so.

I don't think there is anything else that's pending other than the sentencing, and given that they have sentenced themselves voluntarily then the Court should be able to sentence them at this moment in absentia.

THE COURT: Right, and I think that that's accurate because they were given notice, they were given an opportunity to show up, they have now had more than six -- well, actually more than eight months to make contact with their lawyers and to come into court and have not done so, so based on what we know right now they are fugitives and, you know, believed to be

```
in Mexico, and appropriate at this point for the Court to go forward with their sentencing in absentia because, again, they voluntarily absented themselves from these proceedings.
```

All right, so, Mr. Balli, let's -- if you-all just want to come up to the microphones, you filed Objections, Mr. Moreno filed Replies to all of the Objections. We can just go through all of these.

PROBATION OFFICER WEISS: Your Honor, I'm sorry -THE COURT: Oh, yes.

PROBATION OFFICER WEISS: Gary Weiss from Probation.

I just wanted to advise the Court that the PSR was last revised on July 23rd following the sentences from May just to update the Defendant's Pretrial adjustment, as well as to give the initial enhancement for obstruction as they did not show, so it did impact their -- this Defendant's offense level computation as well as his sentencing options.

THE COURT: Okay, very well.

And this is a zero to 20-year case, and let's just begin with the Base Offense Level. It's currently scored at a 26, Mr. Balli, then there's a plus 6 because the funds were believed to be proceeds of an offense involving the distribution of a controlled substance; a plus 2 because it's a violation of 18 USC 1956(h); a plus 2 if it involved sophisticated laundering; a plus 2 for obstruction of justice because the Defendant absconded and failed to appear at

6

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

327.

through them.

1 sentencing that was previously noticed out for May of 2019 and, 2 of course, no acceptance because they were convicted by a jury trial. And so that's a Level 38, Category II. It's a range 3 4 that is higher than a maximum statutory penalty, it is 262 to

Mr. Balli, I'll let you just go through the 7 objections one by one. I have read them all in detail, I don't 8 know that -- you know, we can just kind of take them one by one, you don't have to really argue all of them because you did 10 so in writing and I carefully reviewed them, but let's just go

MR. BALLI: Your Honor, I just want to begin again by renewing the objection to sentencing Mr. Montes Patino in I believe even though the case law is against me -absentia. well, I think all of the case law would be against me based on the Court's finding, but I think under the Sixth Amendment he has a right to be present before the Court for his sentencing. And the evidence presented earlier is insufficient to show that he voluntarily absented himself from the proceedings. simply don't know what happened to him, Judge, and so I renew my objection and make that factual objection which you knew with the new information that we have today, Judge.

THE COURT: And, again, I understand that you're doing your job as his lawyer, but he was invited to come in, his wife was invited to come in. They were residing in Dallas.

1 They vacated the premises, they cut off their GPS device. 2 have been given every invitation and opportunity to communicate 3 with you or family members to notify you if something, for example, had happened. If they had been in an accident and 4 5 were in a hospital with some type of amnesia family members could have filled us in as to reasons like that, but we don't 6 7 have any information to indicate that there is anything like that. All of the information at this point indicates that they 8 9 were aware of the proceedings and voluntarily absented 10 themselves. But I understand for the record your objection 11 will be noted and --12 MR. BALLI: And all of those same arguments, Judge, 13 I'm making for the obstruction based on the facts presented that there is insufficient evidence of the two-level upward 14 15 adjustment for obstruction, Judge. 16 Okay, very well. And, again, I'd also THE COURT: 17 rule, just let me -- I'll go ahead and rule on that; that will 18 also be noted and overruled. There is some ample evidence that 19 they failed to appear voluntarily and that is classic 20 obstruction of justice. All right. 21 MR. BALLI: And, your Honor, the other objection is, 22 you know, originally our PSR had a different score of 22 and 23 that was based on the fact that on the amount of money 24 laundering, the original PSR was properly calculated with the 25 Base Offense Level of --

MR. MORENO: It's a million 187,944.

MR. BALLI: That was the amount of currency and that gave us a Level 22, I believe, let me -- a Level 22, Judge, and so that was the proper amount of currency.

The PSR is reflective to some degree of what the evidence at trial. However, there is insufficient evidence that the amount added up to 5 million 479,024, which is the amount that the PSR now says that Mr. Montes Patino is accountable for, is part of reasonably foreseeable acts of jointly undertaken criminal activity. Mr. Montes Patino and his wife, they worked -- you know, the evidence at trial showed that they had specific amounts of currency.

Ms. Galvan-Constantini was -- there was a seizure related to her. There was another seizure related to Mr. Montes Patino. Those amounts were about \$750,000, 800,000, and so it doesn't come anywhere near this 5 million 479,000.

And although I think there was evidence that

Ms. Galvan-Constantini was -- knew about other activities that

were going on, the same cannot be said for Mr. Montes Patino

and even with the knowledge that Ms. Galvan-Constantini had it,

it didn't -- the evidence didn't show that she -- it was part

of jointly undertaken activity, just it was just information

that she had, Judge, and so we would object to the Level 26 and

ask that the Court score the original Level 22 Base Offense

Level.

THE COURT: Okay. Government response?

MR. MORENO: As we detailed in our response there was a number of exhibits that were introduced, I think I included them in my response, they are Government Exhibits or Trial Exhibits 10, 11 and 12 which were the ledgers that were introduced into evidence with the payments that were made or received by the confidential source. She testified to those and explained them, and testified that she met with both Defendants on a number of occasions both here in Laredo and San Antonio, and I believe she said once in Houston. And those notations are also in those same ledgers.

When the Defendant testified he didn't deny it; in fact, he admitted a couple of those encounters and coming down to them. Their defense, if the Court will recall, was that they were basically out of statute of limitations with regards to the offense, not that they didn't commit the offense or that they weren't involved in any of these transactions.

Obviously the jury verdict supported the Government's theory of the case and the testimony of the source in this case, and so the amounts that are listed there are strictly amounts that are accumulated from the testimony and from those ledgers, your Honor, and so I believe that that amount should be correct.

THE COURT: Okay, and I think the Defense also cited US versus Harper which is 448 F3d 732, Fifth Circuit 2007 case

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

saying that proof by a preponderance of the evidence is not exactly the appropriate standard, that it should be a higher standard than just regular preponderance of the evidence because of the large effect on Defendant's sentencing exposure, and your belief is that to go from a Level 22 to 26 doesn't implicate the protections of Harper? I wouldn't think so, your Honor. MR. MORENO: think the verdict was determined on proof beyond a reasonable doubt, not on a preponderance of the evidence, and this was all evidence that the jury heard and listened to and saw in the exhibits, and so I don't think that's implicated in this particular instance, your Honor. THE COURT: I think the Defense also said that the jury verdict, however, is not determinative of the reliability of particular exhibits. But when we look at 10, 11, 12, and the argument that the notebooks were unreliable because of the simple fact that the C.S. had them and kept them before she eventually turned them over to agents, we don't only have that, we have her testifying, we have Mr. Patino himself testifying --MR. MORENO: Correct. **THE COURT:** -- and the jury was entitled to evaluate the testimony in addition to the notebooks and make the determination as to guilt or innocence as to all of the Defendants.

```
1
              MR. MORENO: Correct, Judge.
 2
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. All right, so --
                         And, Judge, I would add that --
 3
              MR. BALLI:
 4
              THE COURT:
                          Yes, sir.
 5
              MR. BALLI: -- there is no interrogatory to the jury
 6
    about specific -- specific amounts of currency --
 7
                         Why would that have been necessary?
              THE COURT:
                         Well, I mean, just related, related to
              MR. BALLI:
 8
 9
    Mr. Moreno's argument that the jury found them guilty based on
10
    the evidence that was there. We -- that doesn't mean that the
11
    jury would agree with this 5 million dollar amount.
12
              THE COURT: Well, but they don't have to. It's just
13
    that the money amounts are sentencing issues --
14
              MR. BALLI: Yes, Judge.
                         -- and so apparently it's not implicated,
15
16
    they're just sentencing issues so that would not have been a
17
    special finding for the jury. I think the point here is that
18
    the jury was able to evaluate all of the evidence, obviously
19
    found it to be reliable because they returned a verdict of
20
    quilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and so from that can the
21
    Court extrapolate that they believe that Mr. Patino was
22
    involved in this conspiracy to launder monetary instruments?
23
              Yes, absolutely.
24
              Then the question which Defense has an issue is what
25
    evidence do we have as to the particular amounts, and so I want
```

```
1
    to make sure that we separate those and I think, you know, to
 2
    say "Well, the notebooks are unreliable because the C.S. had
 3
    them secretly for some time before she turned them over to the
    Government" I don't that carries the day. I heard the
 4
 5
    testimony myself and the jury believed the C.S. was credible,
    and I found her to be credible, and I think that there was
 6
 7
    sufficient evidence to back up these amounts, so the objection
 8
    is noted and overruled, it will be a Level 26.
 9
              Next objection?
              MR. BALLI: Your Honor, just with regard to the rest
10
11
    of the objections, we'd just, you know, present to the Court
12
    what we have already submitted and ask the Court to consider
13
    that and rule on that, Judge.
14
              THE COURT: Okay, very well. And, again, each of you
15
    filed very detailed objections, cited appropriate case law.
16
    have reviewed them all and the rest of the objections are
17
    overruled.
18
              So, Mr. Patino is a 262 to 327 with a cap of 240.
19
              Mr. Balli, do you want to make any other arguments on
    his behalf?
20
21
              MR. BALLI:
                          Yes, your Honor. You know, we'd like the
22
    Court to consider several things about Mr. Montes Patino.
```

Mr. Montes Patino was in the United States for -- he immigrated here in 1995 so, you know, we're talking about 25

25 | years in the United States. He came as a lawful permanent

23

24

resident, established a business in the Dallas area, was working in the insurance and in bus -- passenger bus administration management. He did that.

You know, I think the evidence at trial would show that from, you know, May 2010-2012 is when there was different incidents related to money laundering. However, after that there was nothing and so he returned to his life of work after that and continued working in bus management, helping his wife with her insurance company which focused also on passenger buses as well, Judge. And so now, at 58 years old, almost 60 years old, Mr. Montes Patino, having otherwise led a law abiding life, Judge, does not require a lengthy sentence to rehabilitate him or punish him, and so we'd ask the Court to take those things into account.

The Guideline in this case is a very high Guideline and, obviously, you know, it's based on the amounts of currency. However, in Mr. Montes Patino's case, because of his age, because of his law abiding life, because he has a work history we'd ask the Court to take those things into account and give him a variance in the Guidelines, and consider a sentence of 120 months.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, you're asking me basically to reduce a sentence by, let's see, let's talk about low ends, 142 months, which is almost 12 years, for no reason other than before this he had lived an otherwise law abiding life.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But when you talk about rehabilitation he's a fugitive. How do we evaluate remorse and rehabilitation and deterrence when he's getting an adjustment for obstruction of justice? I mean, you are making all of the right arguments for him on the record, there's only so much you can -- I understand he was a lawful permanent resident; otherwise law abiding, smart individual, some college from Mexico, but it becomes very difficult to say he's a person with potential for rehabilitation when he has voluntary absconded himself. MR. BALLI: Well, and, Judge, what I'd like to add is typically in a case like this where if, you know, it's true that he is a fugitive then he could also be charged for that. THE COURT: Right. MR. BALLI: The Court at that time, whatever sentencing court would deal with that if he is charged with

MR. BALLI: The Court at that time, whatever sentencing court would deal with that if he is charged with that, (indisc.) will be, but more than likely he would be if that's the case, could consider a consecutive sentence to that based on what information they have about, you know, his whereabouts --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BALLI: -- and what it is that happened. And so at almost 60 years old, 120, 70, puts him at 70 years old and then any potential sentence on top of that put him at, you know, 72 or 75, possibly even 80 years when he gets out of

```
1 | prison so --
```

- THE COURT: Well, that's assuming they ever actually catch him.
- 4 MR. BALLI: Yes. Yes, Judge.
 - THE COURT: But I'm aware that he could be charged with other matters, but in this case he scores above the maximum statutory penalty, 262 to 327, and so to say "Well, let's just slash it by almost 14 years just because he's an older individual is really, I don't think, appropriate. And you mentioned the other facts, he is going to lose his permanent resident status and so forth.

Government, do you want to say anything?

MR. MORENO: Your Honor, I think because it scores so high I understand that if the statutory maximum becomes the only reliable Guideline range because what we had originally requested is a Guideline -- a sentence within the Guideline range when it was, you know, 210 and 262, I think now with all of the added charges he's gotten way above that and so I think the only sentence that fits within the Guideline now is the maximum sentence under the statute issues, 20 years.

Given the Defendant's conduct and their participation in this very extreme large money laundering scheme, I would remind the Court that, you know, there was testimony in the trial that they were aware not only of what was going on in this particular vein of the money laundering scheme, but also

familiar with some of the going ons that were going — that were happening in California and on the West Coast, and so they were aware of the large scope of this organizational venture to launder money in this fashion, and so I think that the statutory maximum is the adequate sentence in this case given their score and given their conduct in this offense, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And I will say just for the record, in case anybody is wondering, Judge Alvarez was kind enough to help cover some of the sentencings in May because I was working on Part 2 of my LO Alum at Duke University so I was out of the state and was not able to handle those other matters.

I will say, obviously, I have reviewed the docket sheet since then and I saw that she did a couple of variances, but those Defendants, of course, all came in to court, they were out on bond as well and came into court.

And I will also note that I was surprised by the variances because having sat as a trial Judge I don't know that I would have varied but, you know, when we turn over a PSR the Judge evaluates all of the facts and all of the evidence and arguments and she believed it was appropriate and obviously I am not, in any way, commenting on that, I'm just simply saying that having been the trial Judge I don't know that I would have varied, but we'll just leave it at that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the Judgment.

```
But in this case if there isn't anything further,
Probation, I will adopt the report. It is correctly scored.
          I have looked at all of the 3553 factors, I've heard
argument from counsel.
          But beyond hearing argument from counsel I have
reviewed the very detailed objections and the replies and
Probation's take on them and my own review of the law and the
evidence and, again, I was the trial Judge in this particular
case and I believe a sentence of 20 years is appropriate,
that's 240 months.
          It will be followed by a term of supervised release
of three years.
          No -- well, was there a recommendation for a fine,
Probation?
          PROBATION OFFICER WEISS: Not in this Defendant, your
Honor --
          THE COURT: Okay, so --
          PROBATION OFFICER WEISS: -- he was a Mexican
national so we pretty much figured he's going to be deported.
          THE COURT: No ability to pay a fine. All right, so
no fine.
         No restitution.
          $100 special assessment.
          A special immigration-related condition, and all
applicable standard and mandatory conditions will also be part
```

Of course there's notice of what those are in

1 the PSR.

Mr. Balli, if I recall correctly before your client decided not to show up for the actual Sentencing hearing you had already reviewed the PSR with him, he just didn't show up and I think it even caught you by surprise that he wasn't in court.

MR. BALLI: Yes, your Honor. We had -- I had reviewed the Presentence Investigation Report with him. He was just coming down a few days before the sentencing to prepare him for sentencing, and then his wife was going to meet with Mr. Pena and prepare for sentencing, I assume --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BALLI: -- but at least that was my understanding was that they were -- she was also going to meet with Mr. Pena and prepare for sentencing, but the PSR was reviewed with him.

THE COURT: Had been reviewed. And that's my recollection of that as well.

And, you know, I guess also for the record this is kind of one of those cases where Defendants should not have been out on bond, but I didn't set a bond, I think it was set somewhere in Dallas and it was a personal recognizance bond so it's kind of one of those lessons to be learned for the future. When someone is facing this much time it's almost -- well, I won't say anything else.

You know, he decided to deport himself versus doing

```
1
    20 years and then being deported, so obviously a mistake to
 2
    have this individual out on bond, but that was not my call.
 3
              He does have a right to appeal so, Mr. Balli, I know
    you haven't spoken to him. He apparently, I guess, has a phone
 4
 5
    that's still voicemail operable, so I would encourage you to
    leave him a voicemail, let him know what the sentence is and
 6
 7
    talk to him about the right to appeal or let him know he has a
    right to appeal the sentence, 14 days to file a Notice of
 8
    Appeal.
10
              Other than that at some point there will be the
11
    formal Judgment, he'll get a copy of that. I would also
12
    encourage you to send that to the last known address or send it
13
    to family members or do whatever you think is best in that
14
    regard.
15
              Government, do you want to add anything?
16
              MR. MORENO: Sorry, I think that the one thing I
17
    forgot to check yesterday was where we were or whether he was
18
    involved in a forfeiture count. They may have not included
19
    that.
20
              THE COURT: I don't know. Probation, was there
    Notice of Forfeiture?
21
22
         (Counsel confers with Probation)
23
              THE COURT: Because usually -- Count makes the
24
    conspiracy to launder money Count One --
```

(Judge/Counsel confer)

25

```
1
              MR. MORENO: No, we have (indisc.), I was trying to
 2
    remember --
              THE COURT: Well, Government, if you'd like, if you
 3
    want to just go back and check on that. I know that some
 4
 5
    Motions had been filed as to some of these other Defendants,
 6
    but go ahead and check if it applies to Mr. Patino. If he was
 7
    here he'd be given a opportunity to allocute as to any
 8
    forfeiture, but he's not here.
 9
              Mr. Balli, do you know anything about that? Do you
10
    want to say anything on forfeiture? Does it apply to your
11
    client, does it not apply?
12
              MR. BALLI: Let me review that. I thought that it
13
    did.
14
              THE COURT: Mr. Moreno, I'm looking here at a June
15
    27, 2019 Preliminary Order of Forfeiture against Mr. Patino for
16
    the amount of $155,530, and that was entered in June of 2019.
17
              MR. MORENO: Yes, so then maybe we were just pending
18
    the Final Order on the pending -- the remainder of his
19
    sentencing so.
20
              THE COURT: Right. So, Mr. Balli, there is a
21
    Preliminary Order. Do you want to object to it for purposes of
22
    the record?
23
              MR. BALLI: Yes, Judge.
24
                         All right. Mr. Balli objects, Mr. Patino
              THE COURT:
25
    can't allocute because he's not here and, again, he chose not
```

```
26
1
    to be here and so, Government, if you'll just submit the
 2
    request for the Final Order of Forfeiture in writing that will
 3
    be granted.
 4
              MR. MORENO: Thank you, your Honor.
 5
              THE COURT:
                          Is there anything further as to Mr. Luis
    Montes Patino?
 6
 7
              MR. MORENO: No, your Honor.
 8
              MR. BALLI: No, your Honor.
 9
              PROBATION OFFICER WEISS: Your Honor, I'm sorry.
10
    Just, I guess, for the purpose of stating the reasons in this
11
    court, I know the Defendants span the Guideline ranges --
12
    exceeded 24 months and the Court imposed a sentence of 240.
13
              THE COURT: Right.
14
              PROBATION OFFICER WEISS: The reason for the specific
15
    sentence, I guess, the statement of reason is that's the only
16
    option --
17
              THE COURT: Well, he scores way above --
18
              PROBATION OFFICER WEISS: Way above, yes.
```

THE COURT: -- the statutory maximum, and the Court believes it to be correctly scored way above the statutory maximum and the Court believes that all of the different adjustments are appropriate, that his role in this case was significant and other than saying that it's properly scored and that it's actually a lower sentence than his Guideline range.

25 I'm not sure we need to add anything else beyond that.

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
27
1
               PROBATION OFFICER WEISS: Yes, your Honor.
 2
               THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, everyone.
 3
               Thank you, Mr. Balli, I know you have a trial to get
 4
         Thank you.
    to.
5
          (This proceeding was adjourned at 8:32 a.m.)
 6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

| CERTIF: | ICATION |
|---------|---------|
|---------|---------|

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

January 28, 2020

Signed Dated

TONI HUDSON, TRANSCRIBER